

Written testimony objecting to the granting of exemptions to the Clean Drinking Water Act for In Situ Uranium mining in the Dewey-Burdock area.

No useful purpose exists for uranium mining. Fukushima has shown us that nuclear energy is not safe. Nuclear energy producing plants are fallible and can be destroyed by nature causing environmental disaster and death to fish, wildlife and humans. Mankind was not wise enough to learn this from Chernopal, but continued on using and building nuclear power plants. Now we have two examples of what can happen using this type of energy.

The only other use for uranium is war. Using uranium in atomic bombs means the direct killing of humans and all life forms in the vicinity where they are dropped and causes extensive environmental damage for a vast area surrounding the bombing sight. **DO NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE NOW HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO THINKS THAT NUCLEAR BOMBS ARE TO BE USED.**

Granting these exemptions would be illegal. It violates the treaty rights of the Sioux Nation. The Pine Ridge and Rosebud reservations will be effected by this proposed mining because they take a portion of their drinking water from the aquifers that are threatened. They also still have hunting and fishing rights in this area pursuant to the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868. These are precisely the issues that are now swinging the tide in the favor of the Standing Rock Sioux and the other tribes who have joined them in their ongoing battle against the Dakota Access Pipeline.

The United States Supreme Court has held in, *United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians*, 448 U.S. 371 (1980) that the Black Hills including the area of the Dewey Burdock proposed mines was illegally taken from the Sioux Nation and awarded them compensation with interest from the date of the taking, 1877. This money is still accumulating and is being held in trust for the Tribe because they do not accept it and want the Black Hills returned to them.

Granting these exemptions would lead to more taking of rights from the Sioux Nation, rights to hunt, fish, gather and to have safe water.

Granting these exemptions would also take property from other people living in the area. It would take the homes, ranches and farms from these people because their home would not be habitable without water and their ranches and farms, their livelihoods, could not support them without water.

More compensation plus interest would have to be paid to the Sioux Nation and to these other people under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The very fact that exemptions to the Clean Drinking Water Act have to be requested indicates that if the party requesting them has no interest in following the law. They want to violate it. If the E.P.A. grants these exemptions they will be complicit in violating the Cleaning Drinking Water Act, one of the most important pieces of legislation the E.P.A. exists to protect.

The water, once fouled by in situ Uranium Mining, cannot be made useable. All you have to do see an example of this is look about an hour's drive south from the area where these mines are proposed to the Crow Butte mine near Crawford, Nebraska. In situ uranium mining there has left the Brule aquifer permanently contaminated.

These exemptions to the Clean Drinking Water Act could only be granted if it were economically viable to mine this uranium. With all that compensation that would have to be paid they cannot possibly be economically viable.

More jobs could be created by bring renewable energy to the area and creating a public transportation system connecting the communities in the area. These systems would provide ongoing employment of people to design and build renewable energy operated transportation and operate and maintain it after it is established.

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)